



The Viganò Tapes

Dr. Robert Moynihan's Interview with Archbishop Viganò

Transcript from [InsideTheVatican.com](#)

View *The Viganò Tapes* and additional content on [Rumble.com](#)

View *The Viganò Tapes* and additional content on [YouTube](#)

For up to the minute updates, sign up to receive [The Moynihan Letters](#)

Travel with Dr. Robert Moynihan on [Pilgrimage](#)

Hello, I am Robert Moynihan. I am an American journalist. I have been covering the Vatican for 30 years; the pontificate of John Paul II, his contest with the Soviet Union, his battle over the culture, the election of Pope Benedict, his pontificate and then the election of Pope Francis and these last eight years. I have many different contacts and friends in the church and among them is Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò. I came to know him many years ago. But in the past three years, this archbishop, an Italian archbishop who is now 80 years old, has become perhaps the single most controversial figure in the Roman Catholic Church. For that reason, I find it imperative to understand how this high-ranking church official could have become such a profound critic of not only of corruption in the church but also of doctrinal confusion, the entire pontificate of Pope Francis, and finally, in recent months, a criticism also of the secular developments, the virus, the vaccines, the global plan for a single global community. And he has reached beyond his traditional area of expertise to become one of the voices in the world today who is most compelling, most controversial and most interesting on understanding where we are right now in 2021 after the year and half of the virus and after many decades of modernity have changed not only the Catholic Church but also the Protestant churches also Judaism also Islam. So we have a wide ranging interview now with this very controversial, very interesting Italian archbishop, Carlo Maria Viganò.

Question Number 1: Archbishop Vigano, very nice to see you again and very pleased that you are willing to answer our questions. The great question has two parts, it's the world and it's the church. We are looking at a global pandemic and a global move towards a new world order and we're also looking at the church in confusion, in division, in concern about how it reacts to this new world order whether it's breaking with its tradition or holding fast to its tradition. And you've got comments to make and insights on both of these questions, the present pandemic and the present crisis in the Roman Catholic Church. So what do you think about the current pandemic and about the current confusion and crisis in the Catholic Church under the leadership of Pope Francis?

It now seems clear to me that we are facing a siege on both the social and religious fronts. The so-called emergency pandemic has been utilized as a false pretext to impose the vaccination and the green pass in many nations of the world, in a simultaneous and coordinated way. At the same time, on the other front, not only do the ecclesiastical authorities not condemn in the least the abuse of power by those who govern public affairs, but they support them in this wicked plan and go so far as to condemn those who do not accept being subjected to inoculation with an experimental gene serum with unknown side-effects that does not impart any immunity from the virus – to say nothing of the moral implications related to the presence of genetic material derived from aborted fetuses, which for a Catholic is itself a more-than-sufficient reason to refuse the vaccine.

We are at war: a war that is not openly declared, that is not fought with conventional weapons, but a war all the same, in which there are aggressors and aggrieved, executioners and victims, kangaroo courts and prisoners; a war in which violence is used in ostensibly legal forms in order to violate the rights of citizens as well as believers. It is an epochal war that is a prelude to the end times and the great apostasy spoken of in Sacred Scripture.

Question Number 2: Archbishop, you have spoken in very stark terms about an undeclared war, and you have spoken about grave dangers, but you've emphasized that you see a type of coordination between the globalists, as we may call them, the architects of this new world order and the Catholic Church with Pope Francis. How can we explain what seems to be a new alliance?

The alliance is not between State and Church but between the deep state and the deep church, that is, the degenerate components present within each.

The State has as its end the *bonum commune*, with respect to both the natural law as well as the divine and positive law. The Church has as her end the *salus animarum*, with respect to the unchanging teaching of Christ. It is obvious that rulers are not pursuing the common good when they expose a population to experimentation without scientific basis, even in the face of evidence of the vaccine's ineffectiveness and the damage it causes to those who have received it. And it is equally obvious that the ecclesiastical Hierarchy, insofar as it lends itself to supporting this massacre planned on a global level, is an accomplice to a crime against humanity and even more to very grave sin against God. The Bergoglian Sanhedrin is clearly integral to the plan of the Great Reset: on the one hand because it is pursuing ends that have nothing to do with the purpose of the Catholic Church, and on the other because it hopes that its complicity can bring it some sort of political and economic advantage in view of the new order.

This criminal complicity is there for all to see, and is further proven by Bergoglio's obsessive vaccination campaign, which by mean of moral blackmail wants to impose inoculation with an experimental genetic serum on everybody. In recent days, he has gone as far as to involve Cardinals and Bishops from both North and South America in this shameful propaganda, including Archbishop Gomez of Los Angeles, the President of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. They too bear responsibility for a grave crime against humanity. Such a scandalous subservience of Prelates to the infernal globalist agenda has been surpassed only by the recent heretical rants of Bergoglio himself.

Question Number 3: You are telling us that the Church has made a shameful alliance with people whose goals are not the same as traditional Christian goals. What price, in your view, is the Church paying for making this choice? Why is it making this choice?

The enslavement of the Holy See and all of its peripheral entities to the pandemic narration is the *preium sanguinis* of a scandalous betrayal, which sees the ecclesiastical hierarchy – with some exceptions – completely integral to the globalist plan of the elite, and not only on the health issue but also and above all on what concerns the Great Reset and the entire ideological structure on which it is based. In order to do this, the hierarchy has had to apostasize doctrine, deny Christ, and dishonor His Church.

The Malthusian ecologism, irenicist ecumenism (that is a prelude to the constitution of the universal religion), the “fourth revolution” theorized by Klaus Schwab and the families of international finance, find in Bergoglio not a neutral spectator – which would itself already be an unheard of thing – but actually a zealous cooperator, who abuses his own moral authority in order to support *ad extra* [outside the Church] the project of the dissolution of traditional society, while *ad intra* [within the Church] he pursues the project of the demolition of the Church in order to replace Her with a philanthropic organization of Masonic inspiration. And it is scandalous, as well as a source of great sorrow, to see that in the face of this ruthless and cruel massacre the majority of Bishops are silent, or rather they align themselves obediently out of fear, self-interest or ideological blindness.

On the other hand, today’s Hierarchy comes from the conciliar school and has been formed and chosen in view of this evolution. In addition to the Episcopate, all of the Religious Orders, Universities, and Catholic institutions have been occupied since the Council by fifth columns that have formed generations of clergy, politicians, intellectuals, entrepreneurs, bankers, professors, and journalists, indoctrinating them into progressive ideology. And just as the Left has done in the political and cultural sphere, so within the Church the Innovators have ostracized any voice of dissent, driven out those who are not aligned, and expelled those who resist.

The persecution we are witnessing today is no different from that of decades past, but now it has been extended to the masses, while previously it focused on individuals and the ruling class. This applies to both the civil and ecclesiastical world – confirming the *pactum sceleris* [criminal conspiracy] between the deep state and the deep church. It seems to me that in this conspiracy the role of the Jesuits has been decisive, and it is no coincidence that for the first time in history a religious of the Society of Jesus is seated on the Throne of Peter, in violation of the Rule established by Saint Ignatius of Loyola.

Question Number 4: In your opinion how does the recent papal decree, *Traditionis Custodes*, the *Guardians of Tradition*, fit into what is happening on the global level? In other words, Pope Francis on the 16th of July issued a startling, unexpected decree cancelling the thousand-year-old, old liturgy of the Church saying, we must now have only one liturgy, the one that was written and introduced in the 1960s. Many Catholics were heartbroken because they have a deep connection with the old liturgy. You believe that there’s a connection between this decision of Pope Francis and the preparation of the church to ally itself to this new global order in the Great Reset. Can you explain how the prayers in the Church are related to the Great Reset?

The decision to abolish the traditional Liturgy – which was restored to the Church by Benedict XVI in 2007 – is not an isolated incident and must be contextualized in a broader perspective. Bergoglio acts on two fronts: an ideological one, with which he wants to prevent any expression of dissent with respect to the failure of the new conciliar path; and also a spiritual one, aimed at preventing the propagation of the objective good of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass in order to favor those who see in that Mass a terrible obstacle to the establishment of the New Order – *Novus Ordo Sæculorum* – that is, the reign of the Antichrist.

It is not possible to believe that Bergoglio does not clearly understand the consequences deriving from his decision, or that he does not realize that depriving the Church of the apostolic Mass is an assist to the enemies of Christ and to the demon himself. It is as if a commander of a division in the height of battle would order his soldiers to fight against tanks using slingshots, laying down the most effective weapons that would enable victory over the adversary.

I am convinced that the faithful, numerous priests and some Bishops are beginning to understand that the question of the traditional Mass is not merely a simple difference of opinion on liturgical matters, and for this reason they wonder how it can be possible that Bergoglio shows so much fury against a sacrosanct rite that is over one thousand years old, unless he sees in it a threat to the realization of the globalist plan that he supports. By the grace of God, the fate of the Church is not in the hand of the Argentine, over whose remains the Vatican vultures are already hovering.

Question Number 5: *Archbishop Viganò, you are telling us that the decision to change the liturgy and to abolish the old liturgy does have something to do with this general crisis and the New world order. What should be the reaction of people in the Church to what is happening as the Church seems increasingly to be accommodating itself to a plan organized by people outside the Church?*

We find ourselves trapped in an impasse, a dead end, from which we cannot escape as long as we do not recognize it for what it is. If we think that the present crisis can be solved by addressing ourselves to the civil or religious authority, as if we were in conditions of relative normality, we continue to not understand that the responsibility for this crisis lays precisely in a betrayal carried out by those hold authority. We cannot ask for justice for a wrong we have suffered if the judge who ought to condemn those who infringe on our rights is their accomplice. We cannot turn to

politicians, expecting them to revoke the violation of our fundamental freedoms, if they are the very ones voting for these violations in Parliaments because they obey those who pay them or blackmail them. And we cannot ask the Bishops – and even less the Holy See – to protect the rights of the faithful, when Bishops and the Vatican consider our request as a threat to the power they hold and to the bankrupt ideology they defend.

Question Number 6: *You have spoken of feeling that we are at an impasse, a dead end, both in the Church and in the world. You've described a type of alliance between the deep Church and the deep State which you feel is not in keeping with traditional Christian teaching or with traditional desire for freedom of the free peoples of the democratic West. But if you are preaching this dead end or impasse, what are you suggesting to people? Are you suggesting some type of disobedience or some type of rebellion?*

Catholics are naturally oriented towards order, to respect for authority and the hierarchy, because this order and authority emanate from the wisdom of God and are necessary for the government of both public affairs as well as the Church.

But precisely because the authority of men comes from God, Catholics – like all citizens in general – cannot accept the usurpation of authority by those who set goals opposed to the very reasons for which that authority is constituted. The Lord has placed at the head of the Church the Successor of the Prince of the Apostles, designating him as His Vicar, so that he may pasture the sheep that He has entrusted to him, not so that he may scatter them, otherwise he would have chosen Judas and not Saint Peter. Similarly, the authority of temporal rulers finds its legitimization in good government, not in making citizens into slaves and forcing them to do evil, preventing them from pursuing the proximate end of an honest life and the final end of eternal salvation. If authority fails in its duties, and even betrays and subverts them, it is no longer entitled to demand the obedience of its subjects.

Obedience, which is a virtue linked to Justice, does not consist in an acritical submission to power, because in doing so it degenerates into servility and complicity with those who do evil. No one can impose obedience to intrinsically evil orders, or recognize authority in those who abuse it to indulge evil. Thus those who resist an illegitimate order apparently disobey the one who gives it, but they obey God, whose power is however exercised by the vicarious authority against its purpose, that is, against God himself.

Question Number 7: Your Excellency, you have spoken of the distinction between legitimate authority and illegitimate authority, between legitimate commands that we should obey and illegitimate commands that we should not obey and resist. But how can we distinguish between them? Isn't it true that St. Paul in his letter to the Romans spoke very clearly about the necessity for Christians to obey the constituted authorities. What do you say?

Saint Paul was a Roman citizen, and as such he had before him the example of a power regulated by laws that later formed the basis for the law of Western nations and which were also adopted by the Church. The authority that governs us today, instead, has cancelled millennia of Greco-Roman and Christian civilization, bringing us back to the barbarism of the Assyrians, to the absence of laws and absolute principles to which even authority itself is bound to conform. Those who hold power present themselves as representatives of the people, but in fact they act against the people, without any constraint, without limits either from above – since they have cancelled the divine origin of the power of those who govern – nor from below, since they do not allow citizens to elect their own representatives unless they are certain they can manipulate the vote to their own advantage.

I would like to underline this barbarization of the law, which in my opinion is the cause of the crisis of authority, of its perversion and its brazen arrogance. These tyrants, barricaded in their palaces guarded by armed guards, behave like Sennacherib, deifying authority in themselves, in a delirium of omnipotence guaranteed to them by the availability of financial, political and media means.

And what leaves us disconcerting is that the masses allow themselves to be tyrannized, precisely in an era that has made Revolution one of the key themes of modernity, to the point of introducing its principles right into the sacred precincts with Vatican II. To a genuinely Catholic perspective, however, chaos manifests itself both in rebellion against good authority and in servile obedience to evil authority, in a subversion that we have today right before our eyes that leaves us incredulous in its anachronistic arrogance.

Question Number 8: So, what you are really saying is that there could be two types of chaos. One is a type of servile submission to illegitimate commands and the other would be a type of renegade disobedience to legitimate commands. How does one distinguish between these two things? And when we distinguish between the two, what can we do to resist the abuses?

In the civil sphere, there is a need to reject any cooperation with the current pandemic narrative and with the climate emergency that may soon replace it. Disregarding regulations that are illegitimate or that expose citizens to concrete risks to their health is morally lawful and in certain circumstances is even a duty. In no way can one jeopardize one's life and health and that of one's children, not even in the face of the threat of retaliation; for in that case our participation would make us guilty before God and deserving of His punishments. In no way can we accept the administration of experimental gene serums, in the course of whose production children have been killed in the third month of pregnancy: **their blood would fall on those who produce them, as well as on those who impose them, and those who receive them.** In no case should it be tolerated that a pseudo-pandemic, whose victims are fewer in number than the victims of the supposed vaccines, become an alibi for imposing controls and limitations on natural freedoms and civil rights. And if the media, enslaved to power and accomplices of this conspiracy, censor every dissenting voice, this should persuade us that the dystopian society described by Orwell is now being realized following a precise script, under a single direction. I denounced it in my Appeal last year, and no one who rereads it today can accuse me of having sounded unjustified alarms.

Let's not forget that since 2010 the Rockefeller Foundation has predicted four *scenarios* for these years, one of which was the pandemic "*lockstep*." Roadmaps have been studied for all of these scenarios, and it is disturbing to see how the one relating to the pandemic has essentially turned out as expected (see *Scenarios for the Future of Technology and International Development*, [here](#)). The thousands of fires started around the world in recent days are providing the *mainstream* media with the pretext to shout about the climate emergency, in the name of which they are already warning us that we will have to prepare for new lockdowns and new forms of limitation of our freedoms and our rights. But then there will be the global cyber-attack or the economic crisis, which have already been studied and planned out, and whose first signs we can observe. All of these strategies have the attack on the individual as their objective – isolated and attacked in his emotionality, in his daily rhythms, in his work – and also attack the masses in an undifferentiated and anonymous way.

Those who dissent, that is, those who do not accept being turned into guinea pigs and seeing the world population decimated by transforming it into a mass of chronically ill, must understand that disobedience is just as necessary as it was at the time of other dictatorships of the last century, and even more so. It is disconcerting that, after having built the rhetoric of the post-World-War-II era on anti-Nazism, no

one seems to recognize that the same discrimination that made concentration camps possible is now arising again in a more ruthless form. One wonders whether the totalitarian regimes of the twentieth century did not constitute a preparatory experiment for what is happening today, starting with the state of Israel.

Question Number 9: *Your Excellency, once again, you are speaking in very dramatic terms about people being used as guinea pigs about humans becoming chronically ill due to the health measures being taken and you are asking for us to resist what you call a type of new totalitarianism. But how could we really come to a united conclusion about the threat we face with so much inability to understand the true facts and to know really what our position truly is? What do you suggest?*

I believe that it is important to open people's eyes, showing them the deception we are facing. It is a deception based on *false premises*, artfully created and imposed in a dogmatic way, to legitimize *false solutions* that have already been planned and implemented.

The pandemic was intended to impose a social control that under normal conditions would have been rejected with disdain by the masses, but which, thanks to media terrorism and the complicity of doctors, politicians, magistrates and law enforcement agencies, could be introduced in many nations and even in the ecclesiastical institutions themselves: in Santa Marta [the residence where Bergoglio lives] one cannot eat at the cafeteria without a green pass, and in many Catholic schools and universities the vaccine is required of all staff and students. Soon they will ask us for the vaccine passport in order to travel, to enter public offices, to vote and to go to church.

I want to be very clear on this point: without understanding the dimension of the problem, without recognizing its authors and discerning its aims, we will never be able to get out of it. Because the Lord, in order to come to our aid, wants us to recognize the evil that oppresses us and understand what causes it, in order to then be able to ask Him for forgiveness and do penance. And the cause of this hell on earth is having abandoned God, having denied Him in His temporal and spiritual Lordship, having usurped the crown to give it to the Enemy. When we understand that the present society, in its delirium of being able to trample on the Cross of Christ, has made itself a slave of Satan, only then will we be able to invoke God's mercy and implore His intervention.

Question Number 10: *Archbishop, you are sketching for us a dramatic confrontation between good and evil. You are speaking of God and the devil. I was wondering if you might go into a little more detail, instead of these sort of overarching antagonists on a colossal scale. What can you see in our history, actual facts in recent years, and even recent centuries, which led us to this war over the fate of humanity, the identity of man, the goal of human life, and leads us to this stark contrast which you see us facing today?*

The answer is far too simple. First of all, as Christians, we know that this epochal war is waged by Satan, the enemy of mankind. Behind the workers of iniquity there is always and only him, a murderer from the beginning. It matters little whether the cooperators of this plan are pharmaceutical companies or high finance, philanthropic organizations or Masonic sects, political factions or corrupt media: all of them, aware of it or not, collaborate in the work of the Devil.

Sin, disease, and death are the unmistakable mark of his work. Sin, disease, and death – not as an evil to be healed, but as a wicked response, as the only alleged remedy to bring life and the material and spiritual health of men. Indeed, as a *normality* for those who no longer live in the economy of Redemption, but in the slavery of Satan who wants to make the effects of original sin irreversible and the Sacrifice of Christ ineffective. To the point that the healthy have come to be considered as potential sick people, as plague-spreaders, as propagators of death; and vice versa, the vaccinated – who are contagious – as the only people presumed to be healthy. To the point that the clergy themselves dare to put the health of the body before the duty of administering the Sacraments and celebrating Mass: the abject cowardice of many priests and Bishops, during the recent lockdowns, has brought to light a desolate picture of timidity, indeed of betrayal, and of a lack of faith among the members of the clergy which shows, if ever it were needed, the proportions of the damage caused by the conciliar revolution.

Because this is the absurdity of what we have seen happening for a year and a half: the response to a seasonal flu has consisted in the prohibition of effective treatments and the imposition of experimental therapies with new gene technologies which, while not curing the consequences of the virus, cause genetic modifications and side effects, heart attacks and myocarditis, deaths of people otherwise healthy or who could recover with the treatments available. And to this is added, like an infernal ritual, the use of a gene serum made with aborted fetuses, as if to renew the human sacrifices of the pagans with a new twist of health, propitiating the coming New Order with the lives of innocents. And while Christian Baptism cleanses the soul of

sin and makes us sons of God in its sacramental character, the satanic baptism marks those who receive it with the mark of the Beast.

How Catholics are able to undergo the vaccine as a sort of satanic baptism without any scruple of conscience remains a question to which an answer must be given. Certainly, decades of systematic cancellation of Faith and Morals in the faithful, in the name of a dialogue with the world and with modernity, have allowed souls to lose all supernatural reference, allowing themselves to be dulled by a formless sentimentality that has nothing Catholic about it. The castration of souls took place at the moment in which the Christian *certamen* [combat] against the world, the flesh and the devil was perverted into an indecorous retreat, indeed into a cowardly desertion. Once soldiers of Christ, many now found themselves to be effeminate courtiers of the adversary.

Question Number 11: *Your Excellency, once again you have shocked us with your polarizing language and your dark tones with reference to the terrific dangers that you see facing us today, referring to castration, referring to poisoning by medical means. Let's shift the conversation just a bit to look more closely on your area of true expertise, which is the life of the Church. You were a leading Vatican official. You were close to Pope Paul VI, to John Paul II, to Pope Benedict and also to Pope Francis. What do you think has happened to the Church that has placed the Church today in such a weak position, vis-à-vis its tradition and vis-à-vis the secular world in general?*

The smoke of Satan entered the Church more than sixty years ago with the Council, and I would say even earlier: the revolution of Vatican II was possible because it was prepared and organized in the smallest details, for decades, by traitors who had infiltrated into the Roman Curia, dioceses, universities, seminaries, religious orders. A work of infiltration that has found the highest levels of the Church inert and unprepared, intoxicated by the winds of novelty, inadequate in the face of the challenges of modern society, suffering from a sense of inferiority that has led them to believe that they are behind the times and out of fashion. And this, we must recognize, finds its main cause in the lack of a supernatural vision, in having neglected the life of Grace for the benefit of a dissipated activism, of an apostolate which is sterile precisely because it is not nourished by prayer and not nourished by Charity, which is the love of God.

The same thing happens today, in the face of a pseudo-canonical overpowering with which illegitimate limitations are imposed on a rite which, even if only considering its antiquity, is in itself exempt from any possibility of abolition.

The problem of the conciliar church – which as I have said several times is superimposed over the Church of Christ as the moon covers the sun during an eclipse – is that it has wanted to come to terms with the world, when the Gospel teaches us that our destiny is to be hated and persecuted by the world: “*If the world hates you, know that it hated Me before you*” (Jn 15:18). “*If they persecuted Me, they will persecute you too*” (Jn 15:20). “*A disciple is not superior to the teacher, nor a servant superior to his Lord*” (Mt 10:24). The conciliar Hierarchy has succumbed to the temptation to choose the easy way of dialogue, rather than courageously walking the way of the Cross, and this has led it to renounce the proclamation of the Gospel, adulterating it, adapting it to the spirit of the world. Let us not forget that Satan is called the “*prince of this world*” by Our Lord (Jn 12:31 and 16:11).

And yet, faced with the colossal failure of this alleged “conciliar spring,” one insists with tetragonal obstinacy on a path that has proven to be suicidal. If Vatican II had at least increased the number of the faithful, one could criticize its method but at least recognize its numerical, if not qualitative, benefit. Instead, the so-called “opening” of the Council has not converted a single separated brother, causing the abandonment of an exorbitant number of faithful. Those who remain in the Church today have a knowledge of the Faith that is almost always full of gaps, incomplete and erroneous; their spiritual life is poor if not completely absent; and the state of Grace is annihilated and neglected.

Where is – I ask myself – this resounding success of Vatican II, on the basis of which we should continue on the path it has taken, after having abandoned the *royal road* that the Roman Pontiffs followed until Pius XII? Even a human evaluation would be enough to understand the failure of the conciliar ideology and the need to repair the mistake made.

And we must ask ourselves – perhaps mercilessly, but still honestly and realistically – if the alleged renewal was nothing more than a pretext, behind which was hidden the lucid and malicious intention to destroy the Church of Christ and replace it with a counterfeit: an intention certainly not understood or shared by the majority of Bishops, but which emerges clearly and evidently in the action of a few organized and efficient traitors. It is no coincidence that they speak of the *old religion* and the *old mass*, in contrast to the *new conciliar religion* and the *new reformed mass*. That furrow, which they have deliberately dug using the Council as a plowshare, today

shows itself to be real, as a *discrimen* that separates what is Catholic from what is no longer Catholic, who is Catholic from who no longer wants to be.

Question Number 12: Your Excellency, you've described now for us a process lasting for 60 years, as you say, in which the Church has faced a type of corruption. You've denounced the corruption on the moral plane, the abuse of children. What you are now denouncing is corruption on the doctrinal plane. You're saying there's been a type of departure from the traditional Christian teaching in the past 60 years. Can you explain even further and in greater detail how you feel this occurred and what can be done about it?

Your Excellency, what you have just told us once again in very stark terms is that something happened in the Church to modernize it and to make it depart from its traditions and you think this is a very terrible and dangerous thing. The Catholic Church held a council, an ecumenical council, in the 1960s, 1962-1965, four years. After the council, the Church said we have now made major steps toward modernizing the Church, making the Church more attractive to modern man. But you believe that this is somehow the fundamental mistake of this period in history. Please tell our audience what do you think happened at the council and why do you think it was such a mistake to the Church to take that path and why is that it has not been denounced by others but only by you?

The problem of the conciliar church lies in having made the revolutionary demands its own, denying the Kingship of Christ and transferring – at least in words – sovereignty to the people, to those whom the clerical elite has convinced that they can choose which truths to reject and which new dogmas to invent. And I point out that, exactly as happened in public affairs, so also in the ecclesial sphere power has been usurped by new entities with purposes opposed to those for whom authority is established; and always considering the people as a mass to manipulate and subdue. The modalities with which the liturgical reform has been imposed are not unlike those with which the *green pass* is imposed on us today: always for our good, always because there are those who decide for us, always telling us lies to hide their true intentions.

If their true purpose was the good of souls, they would have had to repent from the beginning, looking with horror at the disaster that has taken place. But if the purpose is truly disaster, one understands the hatred and aversion to everything that seeks to limit it and repair the damage. Seen in this light, *perseverare diabolicum* [to persist

is diabolical]. And this is true both for obstinacy about the Council as well as for obstinacy about the pandemic farce.

Question Number 13: *Your Excellency, you have now given us a type of revisionist view of the last 60 years of Catholic history. But now I'd like to push back the horizon here for a century or more. What we'd really like to understand is your view of where this came from. And I know as we've spoken on other occasions that you have a precise theory and it has to do with enlightenment, the decline of the ancien régime, the old regime in Europe which had been alive with the Church, the coming of the French Revolution, and all of the changes that brought about in the 19th century, the early part of the 20th century leading up to the council. That's your, as it were, your back story for how the Church became modern and, in a sense, in your view post-Christian after the Second Vatican Council. But what happened prior to that? Can you explain your view of the Enlightenment and the post-French Revolution period?*

Your Excellency, many, many people believe that the Enlightenment led to a great opening of the human mind. They feel that it was a wonderful advance in human history. It is only a few who have critiques of that period and they base it on a religious basis, like yourself. But can you lead us through your understanding of what happened in the Enlightenment that causes you to consider it virtually an Endarkenment? What forces were playing a role? You have spoken to me on other occasions of the group called Freemasonry and of their interest in bringing some of these changes about. Can you discuss this?

Freemasonry is the mystical body of Satan, because Satan is the entity that it adores at its highest levels of initiation. The “illumination” which it promotes to its members consists in subjecting them to the cultic worship of a Great Architect, which shows his infernal features only when one is no longer able to turn back. The Enlightenment, like other philosophical movements, was the cultural and ideological instrument with which Freemasonry corrupted the European elites and mobilized the masses to rebellion against the authority of Sovereigns and also the authority of the Roman Pontiffs. The numerous encyclicals condemning the infamous sect demonstrate the wisdom of the Church and the lucidity of the judgment of the Popes, just as they reveal the infiltrations and complicities of the conciliar Hierarchy.

Question Number 14: But some say the Enlightenment also was influenced by certain Eastern philosophies that started to reach the West. May you comment on this?

The neo-pagan philosophies and currents of Eastern spiritualism have insinuated into our society a positive evaluation of concepts that originated in a Gnostic and Masonic matrix. This is not a coincidence: many of these movements are nothing other than the religious declination of the philosophical principles of the Enlightenment, of relativism, of subjectivism, of liberalism and all the modern errors. Thus the illumination of Buddha – consisting of a sort of awareness of one's own divinization or of one's annihilation into a pantheistic whole – finds its correspondent in the blasphemous Universal Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, who becomes the center of the world after having ousted Jesus Christ.

True religion defends the individuality of each person in his intimate relationship with his Creator, Lord, and Redeemer and in his relationships with his fellow men. By contrast, in the new anthropocentric conception, the individual is annulled into an indistinct mass in which the State is lord and master of its citizens, and this has laid the foundations for Socialism, Communism, Nazism, and today's transhumanist globalism. It will not escape notice that, accordingly, the anthropocentric and communitarian approach is the distinctive mark of the Novus Ordo, in stark contrast to the theocentric vision of the Traditional Mass.

I would like to recall that Buddhism, in particular the Buddhism of *Soka Gakkai International*, is a sort of Eastern version of conciliar ecumenical thought, and it is not surprising that its president, Daisaku Ikeda, collaborated with Aurelio Peccei and the *Club di Roma* precisely in giving the movement a religious imprint that predisposed its adherents to Masonic and globalist principles, steeped in ecological pantheism and pacifism, which today the Bergoglian church has adopted as its own ([here](#)). All of the principles professed by *Soka Gakkai* coincide with the principles of globalism and the New World Order, borrowing heavily from the same lexicon ([here](#)). It is also interesting to note that *Soka Gakkai* represents a “heresy” of traditional Buddhism, in the exact same way that the conciliar religion is heretical with respect to Roman Catholicism or Zionism is with respect to Orthodox Judaism. When the project of the Universal Religion becomes a reality, the faithful of the religions that do not accept the Masonic and globalist vision will be excluded. But already now we see a true skimming off the top, so to speak, between progressives and fundamentalists.

Question Number 15: *Archbishop, what we want to understand is the extent of your condemnation of what we have been taught about the Enlightenment. How can you see it so differently from what our academics and what our entire society has taught us about the glory and the goodness of the French Revolution, liberty, equality, fraternity? Can you make a deep dive into this subject and give us something to enable us to better understand your position?*

Like everything that does not come from God, so also Enlightenment thought is mendacious and false, since it promises an unattainable paradise on earth, a human utopia based on an immanentism that contradicts the objective reality of a personal and transcendent God. The principles of the Enlightenment are chimeras: grotesque counterfeits. Masonic liberty is license; Masonic fraternity is a pact between conspirators against God; Masonic equality is a miserable flattening of individuality and a disavowal of the social and religious order. And it is also significant that the same people who propagandize equality also consider membership in the Masonic lodge as a condition of privilege that places them in a position of moral superiority with respect to the uninitiated masses.

Question Number 16: *The Revolution in France, the French Revolution, brought about a monumental change in the social and political structure of Europe. It ended the monarchies. It brought in the democracies. We've now inherited that revolution for the past 200 years. It appears that now we are on the cusp of a final great revolution which will take us from the idea of democracies or separate states to the idea of a single, unified, global state. Can you comment on this present prospect?*

The modern State was born from the political, social, and religious conspiracy of the Masonic sects that wanted to cancel the Kingship of Our Lord, first from civil society by means of the French Revolution, and then from the Church by means of Vatican II. The very concept of democracy and popular sovereignty, in addition to being a deception for the people, originated in an anti-Catholic and antichristian context, in clear antithesis to the power of Sovereigns as a *vicarious* expression of the power of God over public affairs.

In the Christian order, the Sovereign stands in the place of Christ in temporal matters, and the authority of the Sovereign moves within the limits of the natural law, the divine law, and the positive law that the Sovereign must stipulate. The concept of the *bonum commune* is tied indissolubly to the natural law and to revealed Truth, and as such it applies in all times and places; while in the modern state the masses decide what is good on the basis of an at-least-apparent numerical majority or, as

happens today, in the paradox of a more organized minority that imposes itself ideologically thanks to the complicity of the media and economic potentates.

The infernal plan to cancel Christianity could not leave out the destruction of the Catholic monarchies, as has taken place in the last two-and-a-half centuries. And in the absence of immutable principles that regulate the life of citizens according to Catholic morality, Freemasonry has been able to corrupt entire generations, indoctrinating them in a false concept of freedom, in whose name it has made man rebellious against the order willed by God – *hierarchy* is a sacred order – and indocile to the Redemption accomplished by Our Lord. Freedom of religion, along with the disastrous freedom of the press and of opinion, also served to insinuate the idea that man is morally free to embrace whatever creed or ideology he chooses, without this choice having any consequence for the eternal destiny of his immortal soul and the destiny of the entire society.

Obviously, these are concepts that after centuries of brainwashing are difficult to understand for the mentality of our contemporaries, above all after Vatican II endorsed them, denying the condemnations that these ideas had merited from the Church.

In this sense, we can believe that the New World Order will organize itself into a synarchy, a single government, in which power will be initially delegated to a small circle and then transform itself into a tyranny that will be headed by the Antichrist. Let us not forget that Satan knows all too well how effective the monarchical system is in the exercise of governance: what he does not accept is that the one who governs should be Jesus Christ by means of his representative, because in this too Satan wishes to usurp the place of the Son of God.

Question Number 17: Your Excellency, you have sketched for us a kind of stark picture of a great challenge to our humanity, to our traditions, to our understanding of our freedom, and the possible loss of that freedom. Do you have anything of hope to leave us with in the vision you have for our possible future as we face these terrific challenges?

I would like to strengthen the hearts of all those who listen to me, using the words which I have used many times before. It is enough to repeat the words of Our Lord – *portae inferi non prævalebunt* – in order to find serenity. These are words that we know well, and based on them we know that the final victory belongs to God. Yet at the same time that we consider eschatological truths, it is also understandable that

we are concerned about our more immediate destiny, that is, what will happen to us in the coming months and years. We are concerned for our loved ones, our children, our elders. We are worried about what will happen to us a few weeks from now, because every single day those who govern are imposing new norms, limitations, and obligations. And if many factors make us think that we are nearing the end times, this does not lessen our suffering over the present and the immediate future.

My first thought goes to Our Lord's words: "*Do not be afraid of those who kill the body, but cannot kill the soul; fear rather he who has power to make both soul and body perish in Gehenna*" (Mt 10:28). The life of Grace, friendship with God, and frequent reception of the Sacraments are for us an invincible medicine against the spiritual plague that strikes humanity. Let us not be frightened by the impending threats: when the devil roars, it means that the Lord is not allowing him to bite. We have at our side the Most Blessed Virgin, she who is our Mother and Our Queen. We entrust ourselves and our loved ones to Her protection, certain that She will know how to strike that ravenous lion as he deserves. "*Resist him, steadfast in faith, knowing that your brethren spread throughout the world are undergoing the same sufferings* (1 Pt 5:9).

Question Number 18: *Thank you, Archbishop, for those hopeful words. Now I will ask my final question. You've left aside one little aspect. Apart from the pandemic, the vaccines, the health passport, many of the Catholic faithful are concerned about the fate of those communities that are tied to the old mass. What can you say about the fate of these communities and the old way of praying in the Catholic Church which so many are concerned about?*

Also in this case, the roaring lion who threatens retaliation and excommunication now has no teeth. The faithful and the priests have understood very well that his threats, his iconoclastic fury, and his now-blatant hatred against the Catholic Mass have revealed him for who he truly is. What can he possibly do to a priest who continues to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice? Suspend him *a divinis* or even excommunicate him? Throw him out of the parish? Reduce him to the lay state? This will not stop good priests from continuing their apostolate in clandestinity, with humility and constancy. It is not the first time and perhaps it is not the last. And those who have understood what is at stake – eternal salvation – will not allow themselves to be intimidated by the unseemly shouting of Santa Marta.

I also urge the faithful to welcome and help these priests with gratitude, encouraging them not to yield in the face of persecution. I invite the faithful to build domestic

altars, around which to gather their brethren in the Faith to feed on the Bread of Angels. The immeasurable graces of the Holy Mass will pour out copiously on our smaller communities, on the Church and on the world. Let us pray that the good clergy may remain faithful to their vocation, so that the lukewarm may find in the divine Nourishment the courage to preach the Word *opportune importune* [in season and out of season], so that those who have forgotten the value of their Priestly Anointing may convert and amend their ways.

In persecution graces always multiply, spiritual blindness opens up to the contemplation of the True and the Good, and hardness of heart melts into docility to the voice of God.

+ Carlo Maria Viganò, *Archbishop*

15 August 2021
In Assumptione Beatae Mariae Virginis

Transcript from [InsideTheVatican.com](#)

View *The Viganò Tapes* and additional content on [Rumble.com](#)

View *The Viganò Tapes* and additional content on [YouTube](#)

For up to the minute updates, sign up to receive [The Moynihan Letters](#)

Travel with Dr. Robert Moynihan on [Pilgrimage](#)